



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,312	07/28/2003	Chia-Ching Chiu	HOPI119513	6598

26389 7590 08/11/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC  
1420 FIFTH AVENUE  
SUITE 2800  
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

DEVORE, PETER T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3751

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/629,312	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHIU, CHIA-CHING	
	<b>Examiner</b> Peter T deVore	<b>Art Unit</b> 3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                       |                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                           | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____                                                |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everard in view of Tickle and Martin.

The Everard reference discloses a portable washing device comprising a bottom wall, inflatable side walls comprising stacked tubular members, the upper member being C-shaped, and a drain outlet (See Figures 1 and 2), but does not disclose an opening, a air valve, a drain valve, or reinforcement between the tubular members. However, the Tickle reference discloses a similar device including a drain valve 45 to prevent drainage during usage of the device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a drain valve on the Everard device in view of Tickle to prevent drainage during usage of the device. Also, the Martin reference discloses a similar device including an opening 40 and an air valve 42 for convenient inflation of the device, and reinforcement between the tubular members 24 to stabilize the device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ an opening and an air valve on the Everard device in view of Martin for convenient inflation of the device, and

to employ reinforcement between the tubular members of the Everard device in view of Martin to stabilize the device.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everard in view of Tickle and Martin as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Kirsch.

The Everard reference discloses a device as discussed supra, but does not disclose the use of a heat seal for reinforcement. However, attention is directed to the Kirsch reference, which discloses a similar device including a heat seal between two layers for improved structural integrity (see col. 2, line 12-15). It would have been obvious to use a heat seal between two layers of the modified Everard device in view of the teachings of Kirsch for improved structural integrity.

Claims 11-18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everard in view of Tickle and Martin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hajek.

The Everard reference discloses a device as discussed supra, but does not disclose the use of an inflatable head support structure. However, attention is directed to the Hajek reference, which discloses a similar device including an inflatable head support structure 36 for improved comfort of the user. It would have been obvious to employ an inflatable head support structure on the modified Everard device in view of the teachings of Hajek for improved comfort of the user.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Everard in view of Tickle, Martin, and Hajek as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Kirsch.

The Everard reference discloses a device as discussed supra, but does not disclose the use of a heat seal for reinforcement. However, attention is directed to the Kirsch reference, which discloses a similar device including a heat seal between two layers for improved structural integrity (see col. 2, line 12-15). It would have been obvious to use a heat seal between two layers of the modified Everard device in view of the teachings of Kirsch for improved structural integrity.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter T deVore whose telephone number is (703) 306-5481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (703) 308-2580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/629,312  
Art Unit: 3751

Page 5

Pd *pd*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gene Mancene", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Gene Mancene  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700